DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 039 UD 021 180

AUTHOR Gudinas, Ruth A.
TITLE Evaluation of Instructional Materials For Social Bias: Making It Work in a School District. Equity Issues Series.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison. Office of Equal Education Opportunities.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [79]
GRANT G008001796
NOTE 22p.: Prepared by the Wisconsin Sex Equity Project.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Bias; Ethnic Stereotypes; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Instructional Materials; *Measurement Techniques; *Media Selection; *Sex Bias; Sex Stereotypes
IDENTIFIERS Wisconsin (Madison)

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the development and implementation of the Instrument for the Evaluation of Materials for Social Bias used in the Madison (Wisconsin) Metropolitan School District. The instrument guides teachers who wish to purchase new instructional materials in determining the level of social bias evident in the materials. Teachers code each selection according to whether ethnic persons and female figures are included and are interacting with persons from other groups. They also tally images in the materials according to their stereotypical or nonstereotypical nature in terms of both ethnicity and sex. A score of below 70 per cent on either criterion indicates that the material must be supplemented in the class. The instrument and directions for its use are appended. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEC 9 1980

ED197039

EQUITY ISSUES

Research and Commentary Disseminated
by the Wisconsin Sex Equity Project
125 S. Webster St., Madison, WI 53702

Patricia Stutz, Editor; Margaret Powell, Betty Schmitz, and Alice Weck, Editorial Advisors

Evaluation of Instructional Materials For Social Bias:

Making it Work in a School District

by

Ruth A. Gudinas

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Harmatuck
Wisc. Dept. of Public Instruction
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WD021180

Disseminating information on topics and projects related to implementing Title IX and achieving sex equity is consistent with the Wisconsin Sex Equity Project's mandate to provide technical assistance to Wisconsin school districts. Lodged in the Equal Educational Opportunities Office, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, the project periodically publishes *Equity Issues* with funds allocated to the Department of Public Instruction under Title IV–Grant No. G008001796. The contents do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Evaluation of Instructional Materials For Social Bias: Making it Work in a School District

by Ruth A. Gudinas

The Madison Metropolitan School District is one of the few school districts in the nation with a Department of Human Relations. It is also possibly the only school district which requires teachers wishing to purchase new materials to go through a detailed selection process, including an evaluation of materials for ethnocentric, sexist and other biases. Although materials need not be certified as balanced, their biases must be documented for the Board of Education before it gives its approval for adoption. Because of the uniqueness of this process and its durability within the school system, it deserves some discussion and evaluation.

Historical Background

As early as 1970, the Superintendent's Human Relations Advisory Council, a group of representatives from community-based organizations in Madison, addressed the need to evaluate text materials for racist bias. Department of Human Relations staff members worked with members of the council's Subcommittee on Textbook Evaluation to develop criteria for materials evaluation, and explore possibilities for applying them. Resource people — men and women of several cultural backgrounds skilled in evaluation — were employed to analyze text and audio-visual materials for racism and sexism and plans were begun for the development of a teachers' handbook.

The evaluations by the resource persons provided a rich source of data from which emerged the first Instrument for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials for Social Bias. At first the instrument was extraordinarily complex, attempting to deal with categories of stereotypes in combination with one another. A fairly intricate scoring process was based on the presence of these combinations. The instrument was edited and first printed in the spring of 1974 and piloted at a Madison teachers' inservice on the evaluation of instructional materials. The questions raised by the participants in the course, as well as their resistance to the lengthy and somewhat tiresome analytical process, foreshadowed the general problems that lay ahead in our attempts to recruit interested evaluators of instructional materials from among classroom teachers.

However, the course participants did some fine evaluations of materials with the instrument. Their insights and work led to another revision of the instrument and the completion of a teachers' handbook on evaluating instructional materials entitled *BREAKING THROUGH BARRIERS IN WORDS AND PICTURES.*

The Program Materials Selection Process

It is fascinating to speculate on how the Instrument for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials for Social Bias might have been implemented in the Madison Metropolitan School District had it not been for the development of a new materials selection process (PMS) during precisely the same school year. A fifteen-member Program Materials Selection Steering Committee, established by the district's Research and Development Department, completed and proposed the format of the new PMS process in August of 1974. The process allowed attendance areas, schools and even individual teachers to recommend for adoption the most suitable materials for their programs. Although the structures originally proposed have been modified and simplified over the years,[1] the PMS process has basically remained the same. It includes the following steps:

1. organization of a PMS committee in the building or attendance area;

[1]An eight-member PMS Coordinating Council now implements the process.

Bulletin No. 1093

DEC 4 1980

2. submission by the committee of a letter of intent indicating needs and budget;

3. description of the program for which materials are being requested;

4. search for appropriate materials and evaluation for relevance to program goals;

5. evaluation of selected materials' reading level;

6. evaluation of materials for social bias and documentation thereof; and

7. submission of a letter of transmittal summarizing the process for the Board of Education.

The development of the PMS process and the Instrument for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials for Social Bias were not, to my knowledge, deliberately synchronized. But it was a happy coincidence, at least for those of us pondering the problem of how to implement the instrument and evaluate materials for racism, sexism, and other biases. Through the PMS process, the human relations evaluation of materials has become institutionalized as a legitimate step in selecting materials for classroom use. Teachers, while for the most part not overly enthusiastic about analyzing materials, are using the instrument and/or applying the criteria for evaluation as a matter of course. They are encouraged to contact the Department of Human Relations when they are ready to evaluate texts and can be personally assisted in the use of the instrument, the application of criteria, or even in the development of new criteria and instruments.[2] Day-long workshops are offered once or twice during the PMS yearly cycle to reach, in a group setting, teachers who are ready to initiate an evaluation. Special half-day workshops are also offered to PMS committees which have made their selections in a particular area – reading, social studies, math, science, language arts, etc. Appropriate assistance can generally be given, and the best evaluations are done as a result of this collaboration between the Department of Human Relations, the PMS Coordinator from the Instructional Services Division and the teacher(s) doing the evaluation.

The Instrument and Its Criteria

Overall, the data supplied by resource people of varied backgrounds have revealed the following problems or biases in instructional materials which supposedly reflect American society:

1. Exclusion. Non-Euroamericans, women, the elderly, persons with handicapping conditions and other groups are simply not there.

2. Stereotyping. The image of members of each of the above groups, when such persons are included in materials, is often distorted, simplistic, limited and even degrading.

3. Historical inaccuracy or incompleteness. Usually one perspective — that of the Anglo or Euroamerican male — is sometimes blatantly, but more often subtly, promoted in text materials which should, by their very nature and by most selection standards, reflect a variety of perspectives for balance and accuracy.

4. Cultural inauthenticity. Representations of cultural or ethnic values, customs and life-styles are usually reproduced by those from outside the culture or ethnic group and thus distorted and inaccurate.

After sifting through the data and discovering the patterns of bias most frequently alluded to by the resource people, we decided to select those biases which could be most validly dealt with by the classroom teacher, regardless of background, with a minimum of experience in such evaluation and instruction on the instrument. We judged the first two problems mentioned to be of that nature. Analysis for historical accuracy, it appeared to us, could be done only by historians with backgrounds in various ethnic or cultural histories; likewise, analysis for cultural authenticity could best be done by those belonging to the cultural or ethnic group described. Classroom teachers generally belong to neither of these groups.

We looked at the opposites of exclusion and stereotyping — inclusion and non-stereotyping — and, using these as our criteria, developed an intricate instrument which would help an evaluator quantify the extent to which non-Euroamericans were included and not stereotyped in the material. After about a year

[2]This happened recently in the case of history courses on Asia, the Middle East and women of cultures other than that dominant in the United States.

of dealing with this instrument, we discovered that while inclusion was relatively easy to measure accurately, non-stereotyping as such was problematic, at least in terms of our having a common cut-off point or score for both analyses. We felt that this common cut-off point was important so that teachers could make some judgment about the level of bias in the materials and about whether supplementation is necessary or appropriate. Thus, we began looking for a *balance of images* in terms of their stereotypical or non-stereotypical nature. While this approach appeared to accept the presence of degrading or insulting stereotypical images still found in materials, it nonetheless gave the evaluator a handle on the overall balance in a piece, which is doubtless the most objectivity that can be expected of textbook publishers at present.[3]

The instrument is presently based on the two criteria of inclusion and balance of images. In Part I, Analysis for Inclusion, evaluators code each selection (chapter, story, filmstrip, etc.) of the piece according to whether ethnic persons and female figures are included *and* interacting and inter-relating with persons of other groups. The codings are used for scoring, and a score below 70 per cent indicates sufficient bias to warrant supplementation in the classroom. In Part II, Analysis for Balance of Images, evaluators tally images according to their stereotypical or non-stereotypical nature and in terms of both ethnicity and sex. Perfect balance is struck when the numbers of stereotypical and non-stereotypical images are equal; again, bias warranting supplementation is indicated by a score below 70 per cent.[4]

Although the evaluation may appear to be simplistic and shallow, and the instrument complex and time-consuming, the usefulness of both has been proven time and again over the past five years. Granted, checking for inclusion is a simplistic process; yet when evaluators have taken the time to tally columns according to ethnicity and sex, patterns of bias are immediately evident, even when evaluators first considered the piece to be inclusive. For example, newer materials, while appearing multi-ethnic and inclusive of both sexes, are often found, after analysis, to include several biases:

1. Multi-ethnicity is often really *bi*-ethnicity, that is, including largely Euroamericans and Black Americans. Other non-Euroamerican groups, if represented, are done so only in token ways.
2. Often a so-called "new multicultural edition" segregates and isolates non-Euroamericans into separate stories, pictures or sections of chapters, where they interact and inter-relate only with members of their own groups.
3. While female figures are present in readers and literature books, again their appearances are often far fewer in number than those of male figures. Of course, sexist language, such as the editorial "he," "man" and "men," automatically exclude over half of the American population.

The analysis for balance also appears shallow, since it focuses on only six role designations. However, use of this part of the instrument has revealed several developments:

1. Evaluators find that the categories of role analysis may be defined broadly enough to include practically all stereotypical or non-stereotypical roles they might wish to record.
2. The same role is analyzed for its stereotypical nature in terms of sex and ethnicity. Evaluators often find, to their surprise and disappointment, that a piece which obviously made strides toward sex balance is still lacking in ethnic balance, or vice versa. Again, close analysis and tallies do not lie and early impressions are sometimes corrected by the actual data.
3. Materials which get high scores in terms of inclusion can have much lower scores when the roles of those included are analyzed, as in the case of the reader which includes many women but portrays them exclusively as homemakers and mothers.

---

[3]It is my personal belief that until publishers employ resource people from a wide variety of cultural groups to author and/or edit their materials carefully for bias, those materials will continue to portray such groups stereotypically or not portray them at all. Such strategies for balanced publishing do not appear to be implemented by publishers at this point in time, judging from the bias still to be found in instructional materials.

[4]Detailed instructions and the instrument itself may be found in Appendices A and B.

In using both parts of the instrument, teachers have generally gone beyond the analysis required and have noted a variety of other biases — ageist, handicapist, classist, elitist, etc. Their comments, together with questions raised by some Board of Education members and our own deepening awareness, promoted a 1978 revision of the instrument. Evaluators are now also requested to complete the grid checklist on the cover page of the instrument. Thus, in a non-quantitative way, attention is drawn to six other ways in which the material may be out of balance.

Problems and Caveats

The principle of teacher responsibility and accountability undergirds the entire PMS process, including the use of the Instrument for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials for Social Bias. Consequently, at least one basic dilemma is generated by the same process. It is one thing for a small group of experts to develop a sophisticated instrument of evaluation, apply it consistently to a variety of materials and find a high degree of reliability in it. It is another matter to develop an instrument for evaluation of bias by any and all teachers in a system, with their vast differences in background, skills, sensitivity and above all personal bias. For there is no way of escaping the fact that each evaluator brings to the process of evaluation the fruits of his or her lengthy socialization as a citizen of this society. Evaluators bring biases to their evaluation for bias. Thus, an instrument requiring a certain amount of interpretation and judgment cannot possibly be expected to be reliable, that is, to yield on one piece of material, scores within an acceptable range of deviance for statistical reliability. As one colleague put it to me, after I had related this dilemma to him, "The instrument does not actually measure the level of bias in a piece of material. It measures the level of bias as perceived by the evaluator." The instrument addresses a combination of personal perspective and actual bias. Thus, scores of the same material can differ widely from evaluator to evaluator.

We have come a long way from our initial concern over this fact and have, for some time, emphasized the awareness-raising value of the instrument rather than its data-gathering quality. On the other hand, the data gathered are significant and often the scores and the patterns represented by them are similar from evaluator to evaluator. Unfortunately, some publishers to whom we have sent data gathered on their materials, complete with explanations and warnings of the instrument's inherent subjectivity, have not understood the issues involved and wonder, in their correspondence back to us, why their scores and ours differ.

Although we have kept all the data collected on instructional materials adopted through the PMS process since fall of 1974, we have not systematically tabulated those data according to material or publisher. The evaluator's subjectivity alluded to above, as well as the questionable validity of some scores because of a lack of instruction or a failure to follow directions, render such tabulation of dubious value. However, some patterns have been noted, particularly when a workshop group has had time to share results and interpretations with each other. For example, scores on the right side of the cover sheet (indicating the level of balance in terms of sex) are generally higher than those on the left (indicating level of balance in terms of ethnicity). Likewise, scores on inclusion are generally higher than those on balance of images for both ethnicity and sex. Thus it may be said that publishers are improving in their portrayal of a multicultural society while their overall improvement in providing a more balanced portrayal of people's roles in that society has not kept pace.

Another problem in the evaluative process is that of disseminating data to other teachers who will use the material but who have not gone through the evaluation procedure. Mandating the PMS committee chairperson to "spread the word" may be the answer but it will place an additional burden on one person, have a questionable likelihood of success and be relatively unenforceable. The question, of course, must be raised: "How can a simple sharing of scores or types of biases with persons who may not be familiar with the instrument or criteria change anything, when it is the process of evaluation itself which changes the awareness of the evaluator and his or her use of the material?" The task of raising the awareness and sensitivity levels of teachers vis-a-vis their biased materials can hardly be addressed by a memo in their mailbox.

Finally, the whole area of supplementation of biased materials must be dealt with far more systematically in the district. The reader may have noted that the evaluation for bias is done after the material has been selected for purchase. While it is hoped that human relations criteria will have been used during

the initial selection and evaluation, application of such criteria can neither be mandated nor guaranteed. Who is to tell a math teacher that she or he may not purchase an otherwise fine teaching tool which may stereotype women or non-Euroamericans? We are not in the business of censorship. Thus, levels of bias must be documented and then should influence the use of the materials, not necessarily their purchase.[5]

The discussion of how to supplement or balance biased materials follows the evaluative process logically and it is usually addressed in the event of low scores. This area is a much larger one than the "band-aid" approach of isolated activities dealing with specific instances of bias which some teachers have developed and implemented. The solution to the problem of biased materials is, of course, to be found in the implementation of a total multicultural curriculum.

In many Madison elementary classrooms, the Individual Differences program is implemented (see Appendix C for the human relations objectives for grades K-5). It is probably the most direct solution to the problem of bias in the curriculum of elementary classrooms, addressing as it does the wide variety of differences that children can experience in themselves and in others on an individual rather than a group basis. Efforts are also presently underway in the district to perfect a secondary program in human relations, piloted during this past school year (1978-79). In addition, we are working with middle school teachers in the development and implementation of multicultural social studies units and activities. The task is monumental, however, despite the enthusiasm of teachers and resource people and the acquisition of packaged materials which we have searched out around the nation.

Conclusion

When we began developing the Instrument for the Evaluation of Instructional Materials for Social Bias, we did not know that its use would become institutionalized in the system's process for selecting materials. We did not know that, by the summer of 1979, literally hundreds of Madison teachers would have evaluated materials for bias, contributed to several revisions of the instrument with their questions and comments, and increased their own awareness of biases both in materials and in their curriculum as a whole.

As it has turned out, the PMS process, including its evaluation for human relations, has worked. For every teacher who resists the process and complains that he or she will "use the same materials rather than do all that unnecessary work," there are many who follow the required steps. They select, evaluate and purchase new materials and use those materials in their classroom with a new and different awareness of their content.

Recently a teacher left a PMS/Human Relations workshop with a smile and a note of surprise in her voice as she said: "Thanks. That was a very interesting morning. I've *learned* today. Keep it up." With those and other encouraging comments in mind, we urge — indeed, *dare* — other school districts to implement a materials selection process like PMS.

Ruth A. Gudinas is Curriculum Specialist for the Department of Human Relations, Madison Metropolitan School District. She received a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Chicago in 1974. She has taught in Rochester, New York, and has done extensive editing and writing in the fields of human relations and Native American culture. She also has facilitated at workshops and inservices given by the Sex Equity Project, Department of Public Instruction.

[5]We have had several instances where teachers have changed their opinion of materials after evaluation and have renewed their search for materials. Incidentally, it was not always human relations considerations which changed their minds; often it was the first time those teachers had had time to look thoroughly at the material, thus finding other reasons to continue their search.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT FOR THE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR SOCIAL BIAS

INSTRUMENT FOR THE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR SOCIAL BIAS

Title _____ Type of Material (Kit, text, etc.) _____

Author _____ Publisher/Distributor _____ Date of Pub. _____

This Evaluation Is: ____ Complete Grade _____

____ Sample (explain) _____

RECOMMENDATION

INCLUSION: ETHNOCENTRISM

____ Recommended for use (score ____%)

____ Recommended for use only with supplementation (score ____%)

SEXISM

____ Recommended for use (score ____%)

____ Recommended for use only with supplementation (score ____%)

BALANCE: ETHNOCENTRISM

____ Recommended for use (score ____%)

____ Recommended for use only with supplementation (score ____%)

SEXISM

____ Recommended for use (score ____%)

____ Recommended for use only with supplementation (score ____%)

INDICATE BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE COLUMN YOUR EVALUATION OF THE MATERIAL IN TERMS OF ITS REPRESENTATION OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:	Not Included	Included but Stereotyped	Included Not Stereotyped	Image Developed Incl. Contrib.	Does Not Apply
Persons representing a variety of sizes and shapes					
Families representing a variety of structures and styles (e.g., single parent families, extended families, etc.)					
Persons representing a variety of social class situations (e.g., "working class," etc.)					
Persons representing a variety of ages					
Persons expressing differing religious beliefs or preference					
Persons with various handicapping conditions					

Other Evaluative Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Evaluated by _____ School _____ Date _____

© MADISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1974; Revised 1975, 1976, 1977, 1979
Department of Human Relations

EVALUATION FOR INCLUSION

ETHNOCENTRISM

1. Total selections evaluated____ (excluding A0's)
2. Total M____
3. Per cent M (2. divided by 1.)____%
4. Total AN____
   AB____
   AH____ +
   AA____
   Total____ (4.)
5. Per cent A (4. divided by 1.)____%
6. Add per cent M and per cent A____%*

SEXISM

1. Total selections evaluated____
2. Total B____
3. Per cent B (2. divided by 1.)____%
4. Total AF____ +
5. Per cent AF (4. divided by 1.)____%
6. Add per cent B and per cent AF (3. + 5.)____%*

EVALUATION FOR BALANCE OF IMAGES

ETHNOCENTRISM

1. Total stereotypical images____
2. Total non-stereotypical images____
3. Ratio of non-stereotypical to stereotypical images in terms of per cent

   Non-stereot./Stereot. ____%*

SEXISM

1. Total stereotypical images____
2. Total non-stereotypical images____
3. Ratio of non-stereotypical to stereotypical images in terms of per cent

   Non-stereot./Stereot. ____%*

* IF FINAL RESULT IS GREATER THAN 70%, CHECK RECOMMENDED FOR USE (see other side)
* IF FINAL RESULT IS 70% OR LESS, CHECK RECOMMENDED FOR USE ONLY WITH SUPPLEMENTATION (see other side)

Ways in which biased materials will be used and/or supplemented:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10

WORKSHEET

TITLE____ EVALUATOR'S NAME____ SCHOOL____

ANALYSIS FOR INCLUSION

	ETHNOCENTRISM							SEXISM		
SELECTION (chap., story, filmstrip)	EURO-AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	BLACK AMERICAN	HISPANIC	ASIAN AMERICAN	OTHER (NON-AMERICANS)	CODE*	MALE	FEMALE	CODE**

*CODE: Ethnicity
- M = Multi-ethnic
- AE = All Euroamerican
- AN = All Native American
- AB = All Black American
- AH = All Hispanic
- AA = All Asian American
- AO = All Other

**CODE: Sex
- B = Both sexes
- AM = All male
- AF = All female

© MADISON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1974; Revised 1975, 1976, 1977, 1979

ANALYSIS FOR INCLUSION (continued)

SELECTION (chap, story filmstrip)	ETHNOCENTRISM: EURO-AMERICAN	NATIVE AMERICAN	BLACK AMERICAN	HISPANIC	ASIAN AMERICAN	OTHER (NON-AMERICANS)	CODE*	SEXISM: MALE	FEMALE	CODE**

ANALYSIS FOR BALANCE OF IMAGES

ETHNOCENTRISM

STEREOTYPICAL IMAGES		NON-STEREOT. IMAGES	
EUROAMERICAN	NON-EUROAM.	EUROAMER.	NON-EUROAM.
ACTIVE	PASSIVE	PASSIVE	ACTIVE
TRADITIONALLY OCCUPIED		NOT TRADITIONALLY OCC.	
CENTRAL	NON-CENTRAL	NON-CENTRAL	CENTRAL

SEXISM

STEREOTYPICAL IMAGES		NON-STEREOT. IMAGES	
MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
ACTIVE	PASSIVE	PASSIVE	ACTIVE
TRADITIONALLY OCCUPIED		NOT TRADITIONALLY OCC.	
CENTRAL	NON-CENTRAL	NON-CENTRAL	CENTRAL

TOTALS: ETHNOCENTRISM

STEREOTYPICAL IMAGES _____ NON-STEREOT. IMAGES _____

TOTALS: SEXISM

STEREOTYPICAL IMAGES _____ NON-STEREOT. IMAGES _____

APPENDIX B
DIRECTIONS FOR INSTRUMENT

Directions

INSTRUMENT FOR THE EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR SOCIAL BIAS

PART I: ANALYSIS FOR INCLUSION (white worksheet, pages 3 and 4)

This page is used to answer the question: "To what extent are non-Euroamericans and females included in a text or kit?

BEFORE USING PART I OF THE INSTRUMENT, CHECK THE FOLLOWING:

- THE BOOK OR KIT MUST BE DIVISIBLE INTO AT LEAST THREE PARTS.
  - CHAPTERS, STORIES, FILMSTRIPS, ETC. THESE ARE CALLED "SELECTIONS" IN THE INSTRUMENT.
- THE BOOK OR KIT SHOULD BE IN THE NATURE OF A TEXTBOOK, AT LEAST INSOFAR AS THE EXPECTATION OF OBJECTIVITY AND FAIRNESS IS CONCERNED. NOVELS, SOME 16mm FILMS, MOST LIBRARY BOOKS ARE NOT ANALYZABLE WITH THIS INSTRUMENT, SINCE THEY MAY JUSTIFIABLY INCLUDE BIAS AND SUBJECTIVITY ACCORDING TO THE AUTHOR'S VIEWPOINT. HOWEVER, A COLLECTION OF SUCH MATERIALS CAN BE ANALYZED FOR INCLUSION.

HOW TO USE PART I OF THE INSTRUMENT:

1. In the first space under SELECTION, enter the name of the story, chapter or filmstrip to be analyzed.
2. Go through the selection carefully, noting to what extent it is multi-ethnic and includes both females and males. Hash marking in the various columns may help you decide how you will code, but the coding is most important. In order for a selection to be coded "M" or "B," at least two ethnic groups or both sexes should be represented in reasonable proportion (not more than 3 to 1), especially where people are shown interacting or inter-relating.
3. Mark the coding under ETHNOCENTRISM AND SEXISM for each selection. If a selection is not analyzable (no people, for example), draw a line through that space and do not count it as an evaluated selection.
4. Be sure you have a coding for every selection analyzed. All selections must be analyzed in order to obtain a valid judgment about the balance or bias which exists.
5. When all selections have been coded, turn back to page 2 and fill in the top part entitled EVALUATION FOR INCLUSION. The following may help you:

1. Total selections evaluated: Count all codings. (Do not count AO's under ETHNOCENTRISM. In this instrument we are interested only in how American people/society are portrayed.)
2. Total M/B: Count number of multi-ethnic selections and those including both sexes. Put totals in spaces.
3. Per cent M/B: Find percentages as indicated.
4. Total A/AF: Count selections which are coded as predominantly non-Euroamerican ethnic and female and put totals in spaces. (Do not count AE's under ETHNOCENTRISM.)
5. Per cent A/AF: Find percentages as indicated.
6. Add, etc.: Find total percentages by adding two percentages as indicated. This final figure indicates what percentage of the selections include non-Euroamericans and females. (Note cut-off point at bottom of page.)

6. Turn back to page 1, indicate appropriate recommendations and fill in scores.

PART II: BALANCE OF IMAGES (white worksheet, page 4)

This page is used to answer the question: "To what extent is there a balance of stereotypical and non-stereotypical images in a piece of material?"

BEFORE USING PART II OF THE INSTRUMENT, CHECK THE FOLLOWING:

— BE SURE TO REFER TO THE DEFINITIONS OF THE VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF IMAGES. THE UMBRELLA TERM "ACTIVE," FOR EXAMPLE, INCLUDES A VARIETY OF IMAGES (SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW).

— A PIECE CAN BE ANALYZED SELECTIVELY FOR IMAGES. NOT EVERY CATEGORY APPLIES TO EVERY CHARACTER OR GROUP. AN ENTIRE PIECE OF MATERIAL CAN BE ANALYZED IN TERMS OF THE ACTIVE-PASSIVE CATEGORY: SOME MATERIALS CAN BE LOOKED AT EXCLUSIVELY IN TERMS OF OCCUPATIONAL STEREOTYPING. HOWEVER, BE CONSISTENT AND COMPLETE IN YOUR ANALYSIS. YOU MUST ANALYZE BOTH MALES AND FEMALES, BOTH NON-EUROAMERICANS AND EUROAMERICANS; OTHERWISE YOUR STATISTICS AND SCORES WILL NOT BE VALID.

HOW TO USE PART II OF THE INSTRUMENT:

1. Reading materials, literature and primary social studies materials: Analyze each major character for her/his role as a whole. One hash mark should designate your analysis of the character in terms of ethnicity, one in terms of sex. For example, if Judy is analyzed as "passive," put one hash mark in the "female passive" box. Judy is also white; thus one hash mark goes into the "Euroamerican passive" space. Limit your analysis to active/passive for children, traditionally/non-traditionally occupied for adults.

   Math, science, grammar and career ed materials: Analyze each picture, phrase, sentence which includes an image. For example, a picture of a Black female engineer would be represented by a hash mark in the "female not traditionally occupied" space and one in the "non-Euroamerican not traditionally occupied" box. All pictures, phrases, etc. that can be analyzed must receive hash marks or you will not get a valid picture of balance or imbalance. Limit your analysis to active/passive or traditionally/non-traditionally occupied.

   Historical materials: Analyze group images. For example, white pioneers might be designated "active" and/or "central." There may also be individual or group analyses of the pioneer men and pioneer women.

2. Count hash marks on either side of the double line for balance of images in terms of ethnicity, then in terms of sex. Transfer totals to page 2 and compute the scores under EVALUATION FOR BALANCE OF IMAGES. Be sure to divide non-stereotypical by stereotypical totals to get the ratio in terms of a percentage.

3. Turn back to page 1, indicate appropriate recommendations and fill in scores.

PART III: ANALYSIS FOR OTHER BIASES
(grid in box, page 1)

HOW TO USE PART III OF THE INSTRUMENT:

1. Indicate to what extent each of the six groups listed are included and represented in the material by checking the appropriate box. Use the following guidelines:

   Not included: group is not represented at all or is represented only in a token way

   Included but stereotyped: group is represented but portrayed in stereotyped roles (e.g. elderly as incompetent, on welfare; obese persons as inept, unattractive; persons with handicapping conditions as unproductive, "abnormal," etc.)

   Included not stereotyped: group is represented and portrayed as normal, productive members of society

   Image developed including contributions: a section or story develops the image of a group or group member(s) as real people, productive, solving problems, sharing human experiences with others in society, etc.

   Does not apply: material would not be expected to include group

* * *

DEFINITIONS

INCLUSION: having males and females and/or members of two or more ethnic groups inter-acting and inter-relating with each other in at least half of the selections which are multi-ethnic or include both females and males.

BALANCE: equal numbers of images which maintain stereotypes of individuals or groups (stereotypical images) and images which break down such stereotypes (non-stereotypical images).

STEREOTYPES: oversimplified generalizations or fixed mental pictures of persons or groups which are created, maintained and reinforced by the repetition of one image or by a failure to include a variety of images.

CATEGORIES FOR IMAGE ANALYSIS

ACTIVE: Refers to the (1) possession of and (2) ability to use power or control in a situation, make decisions, solve problems, take control, etc.

TRADITIONALLY OCCUPIED: Refers to the holding of a position traditionally occupied by members of one's own ethnic or sex group in American society (see attached list).

CENTRAL: Refers to the person who is the key figure in the story or chapter or from whose point of view the material is written.

PASSIVE: Refers to (1) the lack of and (2) the inability to use power or control in a situation; being controlled or led; being the problem, etc.

NOT-TRADITIONALLY OCCUPIED: Refers to the holding of a position not traditionally occupied by members of one's own ethnic or sex group in American society (see attached list).

NON-CENTRAL: Refers to the person who has a secondary or supportive role in the story or chapter.

APPENDIX C

HUMAN RELATIONS OBJECTIVES
GRADES K - 5

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES: AN EXPERIENCE IN HUMAN RELATIONS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

This handbook (available for purchase) is an activity oriented book that has been described as a mini-course in anatomy, physiology, sociology, and psychology for young children. There are many illustrations for bulletin board use all geared to help educators* implement the following goal:

GOAL: TO PROMOTE AN UNDERSTANDING AND RESPECT FOR SELF AS AN INDIVIDUAL AND TO ACKNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTAND AND RESPECT THE INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN OTHERS.

It is divided into five books covering eight objectives. When used in sequence these objectives will provide the student with layered learning about people.

BOOK ONE:	OBJECTIVE I:	Child will recognize everyone including self as a unique member of the human family and will be able to list some common needs of ALL members of the human family.
	OBJECTIVE II:	Child will recognize self as a unique individual, with both capabilities and limitations, and will be able to recognize and list both types of his/her own differences.
BOOK TWO:	OBJECTIVE III:	Child will be able to list individual "inside" differences (i.e. ideas, beliefs, values and attitudes) and will be able to state why these differences are just as important to others as his or her own are to self.
BOOK THREE:	OBJECTIVE IV:	The child will recognize that each individual has emotions and feelings and different ways of expressing these emotions and feelings, and the child will be able to give examples of emotions and the ways they can be expressed.
BOOK FOUR:	OBJECTIVE V:	Child will be able to define prejudice in his or her own words and give examples of it.
	OBJECTIVE VI:	Child will be able to identify his/her own dislikes (as opposed to his/her own prejudices) and substantiate these dislikes with reasons.
	OBJECTIVE VII:	Child will be able to explain several biological differences and their relationship to prejudice.
BOOK FIVE:	OBJECTIVE VIII:	Child will be able to list several cultural differences within our country, realizing how these differences contribute to the enjoyment of the human family.

Later, there will be a research design that will help the educator assess the needs of a class and to measure the impact of the activities in the handbook on the class.

*Anyone attempting to teach children about people, e.g. educators, parents, teachers, group leaders.

ETHNIC "OCCUPATIONAL" STEREOTYPES

Black American:	Slave, sharecropper
	Athlete
	Entertainer
	Laborer
	Public or private servant
Asian American:	Laundry owner/worker
	Restaurant owner/worker
	Martial arts specialist
	Engineer
	Charlie Chan type
Native American:	Warrior
	Hunter
	Artist or craftsperson
	High steel worker
	Alcoholic
	Unoccupied, unemployed
Latino American:	Migrant, field worker
	Rancher, ranch hand
	Singer, dancer
	Unoccupied, unemployed

If members of a group are found in roles other than those above, they are very likely in non-stereotypical occupational roles. Do not analyze family or household roles in terms of ethnicity even though they may be analyzed in terms of sex.

TRADITIONAL FEMALE OCCUPATIONS

Nurse
Cashier
Bank Teller
Crossing Guard
Waitress (Except in high cost restaurants)
Cafeteria Server
Piano Teacher
Housekeeper
Maid
Advisors, Leaders of Girls Youth Organizations
Telephone Switchboard Operator
Light Assembly Worker
Social Worker
Keypunch Operator
Home Economist
Girls Physical Education Teacher
Demonstrator of Household and Personal Care Products
Secretary
Office Clerk
Typist, Stenographer
Librarian
Pre-school Elementary Teacher School Aides
Airline Stewardess (Except on International Airlines)
Harpist, Flutist
Beautician
Manicurist
Dental Assistant, Hygienist
Receptionist
Seamstress
Lab or X-ray Technician
Speech Therapist
Dietician
Occupational and Recreational Therapist
Cook (Except in high cost restaurant)

OCCUPATIONS TRADITIONALLY SHARED BY BOTH MALE AND FEMALE

Research
Fashion Designer
Physical Therapist
Actor
Performer (Dancer, Singer)
High School Teacher
Interior Designer Decorator
Cosmetologist
Florist
Model
Reporters